	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Notice of Allowability	09/497,373	ALON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jeffrey A. Smith	3625
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RI	ars on the cover sheet with the co (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this apport or other appropriate communication GHTS. This application is subject to	plication. If not included not included not included the mailed in due course. THIS
1. \square This communication is responsive to <u>response filed 2/9/06</u> .		
2. \boxtimes The allowed claim(s) is/are $2-4,6,8-19,21-23,25,27-35,56-6$	1,64-77 and 80-92.	
3. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority un a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of the: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * Certified copies not received: Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMITHIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE. 4. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submit INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which give 5. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson 1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Paper No./Mail Date Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.1 each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the content of the priority documents and the depose attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT Ferrority documents and priority docume	been received. been received in Application No cuments have been received in this of this communication to file a reply ENT of this application. tted. Note the attached EXAMINER is reason(s) why the oath or declara it be submitted. on's Patent Drawing Review (PTO- Amendment / Comment or in the Comment or in the Comment of the drawing the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(content).	national stage application from the complying with the requirements 'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF tion is deficient. 948) attached Office action of the back) of d). nust be submitted. Note the
Attachment(s) 1. ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2. ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3. ☐ Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No./Mail Date	6. ☐ Interview Summary Paper No./Mail Dat 3), 7. ☐ Examiner's Amenda	e

Application/Control Number: 09/497,373

Art Unit: 3625

REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Page 2

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Group A:

Regarding claim 6

The prior art of record neither anticipates nor fairly and reasonably teaches a method for using a computer to facilitate a sales transaction for purchasing a product/service by a group of buyers from a seller, comprising, inter alia, the steps of automatically providing by the agent entity each received suggested price quotation to at least a plurality of the sellers for review, wherein the agent entity is an agent of the group of buyers; and receiving by the agent entity another suggested price quotation for the product/service from the at least one of the plurality of sellers.

Regarding claims 25 and 74

Claims 25 and 74 are each parallel in subject matter to the feature noted above with respect to claim 6 and are allowable for reasons similar to those provided for claim 6.

The most remarkable prior art of record is to Pallakoff (U.S. Patent No. 6,269,343) and Reuhl et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,873,069).

Page 3

Although Pallakoff discloses many features similar to those recited in the above-indicated claims, Pallakoff still fails to teach the above-noted features in the above-noted claims.

Reuhl et al. teaches that a price-changing function of the system is responsive to competitive price data on identical or substantially similar products in multiple geographic markets for multiple competitors (col. 3, lines 58-61). This teaching, however, falls well short of teaching automatically providing by an agent entity each received suggested price quotation (from a seller) to at least a plurality of sellers for review; and receiving by the agent entity another suggested price quotation for the product from at least one of the sellers. Moreover, Reuhl et al. does not teach that such price-changing function serves to facilitate a sales transaction for purchasing a product by a group of buyers.

Group B:

Regarding claim 8

The prior art of record neither anticipates nor fairly and reasonably teaches a method for using a computer to facilitate sales transaction for purchasing a product/service by a group of buyers from at least one seller, comprising, inter alia, the step of verifying that a plurality of buyers in the group satisfy a predetermined requirements list that requires a plurality of buyers in the group to have a common employer, wherein the common employer is independent of the seller.

Regarding claims 27 and 56

Claims 27 and 56 are each parallel in subject matter to the feature noted above with respect to claim 8 and are allowable for reasons similar to those provided for claim 8.

Regarding claim 90

The prior art of record neither anticipates nor fairly and reasonably teaches a method for using a computer to facilitate a sales transaction for purchasing a product/service by a group of buyers from a seller, comprising, *inter alia*, the step of verifying that a plurality of buyers in the group share a common

characteristic associated with a third party that is not any of the buyers or the seller.

Regarding claims 91 and 92

Claims 91 and 92 are each parallel in subject matter to the feature noted above with respect to claim 90 and are allowable for reasons similar to those provided for claim 90.

The most remarkable prior art of record is to Pallakoff (U.S. Patent No. 6,269,343), Shkedy (U.S. Patent No. 6,260,024), Brown (U.S. Patent No. 5,794,219) and Goddard (U.S. Patent No. 6,876,983).

Although Pallakoff discloses many features similar to those recited in the above-indicated claims, Pallakoff still fails to teach the above-noted features.

Shkedy discloses "[c]ryptographic protocols are provided to authenticate the identity of buyer and/or sellers and verify the integrity of buyer and seller" (col. 7, lines 5-8). This teaching, however, falls well short of providing a step of either verifying that a plurality of buyers in the group share a common characteristic associated with a third party that is not any of the buyers or the seller or verifying that a plurality of buyers in the group satisfy a predetermined requirements list

Page 6

Art Unit: 3625

that requires a plurality of buyers in the group to have a common employer, wherein the common employer is independent of the seller.

Brown discloses a method of conducting an on-line auction with bid pooling. The method pits groups of bidders against each other in order to win an auctioned item. Although associations with a third-party can be formed (col. 7, lines 54-56), there is no requirement that a bidder share a common characteristic with the third-party and there is no verification that a bidder shares a common characteristic with the third-party. Similarly, Brown fails to teach a step of verifying that a plurality of buyers in the group satisfy a predetermined requirements list that requires a plurality of buyers in the group to have a common employer, wherein the common employer is independent of the seller.

Goddard (U.S. Patent No. 6,876,983) discloses a system and method for facilitating aggregate shopping. Goddard teaches that each shoppers group can be characterized by geographic location and other characteristics other than a designated product which may be used to differentiate between various groups (col. 4, lines 31-36). These characterizations are made as an analysis of a group after it is formed, but are not taught as a requirement that member of the group share a common

characteristic with a third-party. There is no verification, as such, either that a plurality of buyers in the group share a common characteristic associated with a third party or that a plurality of buyers in the group satisfy a predetermined requirements list that requires a plurality of buyers in the group to have a common employer, wherein the common employer is independent of the seller.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey A. Smith whose telephone number is (571) 272-6763. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert M. Pond can be reached on 571-272-6760. The fax phone number for the

Application/Control Number: 09/497,373 Page 8

Art Unit: 3625

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

e₩frey Af Smith rimary Examiner

Art Unit 3625